

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This letter is responsive to the Office Action mailed on November 17, 2008.

1. Reply to Examiner's Response to Amendments and Arguments

Prior to addressing the specific rejections of the claims, the Applicant would like to address the concerns raised by the Examiner starting on page 2 of the Office Action under the heading "Response to Amendments and Arguments".

A. Dynamic determination of contextual state

The Examiner rejected the Applicant's arguments that the cited references do not determine whether a word is associated with an expression by utilizing a contextual state. To support this argument, the Examiner cited col. 7, lines 47-53 of Hummel et al. and stated that: "each placeable and the type is determined using information for each character. The identification is dynamic since the determination of a placeable determines on what type of phrase or sentence and what the phrase or sentence comprises of."

The Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portion of Hummel does not discuss the use of context. Whether or not a placeable and its type are determined by examining each character does not indicate that context is considered. For example, a placeable could be a date. Examining every character of a token and identifying a date therein does not mean that context is considered. This merely indicates that a string of characters is examined and identified as a date. There is nothing to indicate that context is involved in this process. Similarly, whether or not the identification of a placeable is dynamic also does not indicate the use of context.

Moreover, placeables are inherently context free. For example, col. 7, lines 54-55 reads in part: "One of the identifying features of a placeable is that its meaning is not likely to vary by context." According to the Hummel reference, the fact that placeables are

context free is in fact what makes placeables so useful. Given that their meanings do not change based on context, "they can be automatically or semiautomatically placed in the target translation" (col. 4, lines 17-18). Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Hummel are not at all applicable to dynamic determinations of contextual states. Rather, Hummel is focused on the use of placeables, which are context free elements.

B. Discussion of the word "called"

The Examiner further stated that "in col. 6, lines 59-col. 7, lines 6, the context information of the designated translated area is used to determine the existence of a placeable. Hence, the contextual state of the word (placeable) is determined through its identification."

As stated above, placeables are context free. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the determination of a placeable does not determine a contextual state.

In addition, the cited portion of the text discusses the context of the word "called" in the sentence "A man, called Mr. Miller, left his apartment on the 25th of January in a car that is capable of driving at speeds above 160 mph" at col. 6, lines 59-61. However, the word "called" is not a placeable. Specifically, col. 7, lines 5-7 indicate which of the words in the sentence are placeables: "Three placeables are identified: Mr. Miller, 25th of January, and 160 mph." As can be seen, the word "called" is not listed among them. In addition, Hummel defines placeables at col.3 line 60 to col.4 line 1 as:

A placeable as used herein is a term that designates data that does not require translation into a target language or, in some cases, data types that are particularly suitable for semiautomatic replacement (e.g., proper nouns, titles and names, formatting information, such as tags or escape sequences, styles, graphics) and data requiring a translation that does not change the context of the data (e.g., physical and currency units, time zones, date formats, hyperlinks etc.).

Clearly, the word "called" does not fit this definition.

The cited portion of the text indicates that the word "called" may be improperly translated from English to German if the context in which the word "called" is used is not known. The reference further states that if the entire token is considered, then a meaningful translation can be made. It is clear that a person reading the sentence would realize that "called" in this sentence means "named" and not "telephoned". However, the Hummel reference does not go on to indicate how its teachings could make this determination. For example, FIG. 3 does not indicate how this could be achieved.

Furthermore, stating that "if the entire token (410) is considered... then you (or a machine) could come up with a meaningful translation" (Hummel col. 7, lines 1-3) does not in anyway indicate how the context of the word "called" is determined. This statement is essentially circular in that it is merely a statement of the desired result and not a teaching of how to achieve the result. Moreover, there is nothing beyond the quoted statement that indicates how this can be accomplished. It does not indicate how the token is considered or how considering the entire token will lead to a meaningful translation.

In addition, the text that follows (e.g. the rest of col. 7) merely discusses placeables and (as indicated above) the word "called" is not a placeable and therefore the discussion of the context of the word "called" does not inform the discussion of the determination of placeables or vice versa.

Thus, Hummel's discussion of the context of the word "called" does not indicate any solution; it merely highlights a problem. In other words, there is no teaching relevant to resolution of this issue in the Hummel reference. Thus, there is nothing in any of the

_____ cited references to indicate how the context of "called" or any other word can be determined.

C. Determination of context states in assembling expressions

The Examiner also made the following arguments:

Further, in comment to the statement by the Applicant that Hummel does not teach 'the determination of context states in assembling expressions.' This statement is respectfully traversed as Hummel uses placeables to assemble expression in another language (see col. 8, lines 1-8). In response to the second argument, regarding Hummel not teaching the use of a contextual state to assemble expression. Hummel in col. 7, lines 49-53, uses determines the type of placeable through context by looking at each character of a token. Thus, the characters of the token are used to determine which information needs to be translated (see example given, in col. 7, lines 10-17, table).

This Examiner's position is respectfully traversed. The Applicant respectfully submits that even if placeables are used in assembling expressions, this does not indicate that context is used or determined. As stated above, placeables are context free and therefore their determination or their use in assembling expressions does not indicate determinations of contextual states.

Moreover, whether or not each character of a token is examined to identify a placeable does not indicate the use of context or the identification of a contextual state. Each character of a token can be examined without any determination of context being made. In other words, the examination of each character does not in anyway imply a determination of a contextual state.

2. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 10, and 12-26 as being obvious in light of ALLEVA et al., Patent No. US 5,970,449 and HUMMEL et al., Patent No. US 7,020,601. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections.

A. Identifying the contextual state of a word

In rejecting claims 1 and 20, the Examiner has stated that: "HUMMEL teaches identifying the contextual state of a word (placeable determined based on context and environment, HUMMEL, col. 4, lines 3-10..."

The Examiner's position is respectfully traversed. The applicant respectfully submits that the Hummel reference does not teach dynamically identifying a contextual state of any words. The Applicant respectfully submits that the text cited by the Examiner, namely col.4 lines 3-10 actually refers to the context of the entire translation text and not to the context of any specific word determined dynamically or otherwise. Specifically, the Examiner's attention is drawn to col. 4 lines 5, which refer to: "the context or environment information of the entire information designated for translation" (emphasis added). The summary then goes on to indicate examples of "context or environment information": "the chemical environment, automotive environment, music lyrics, legal environment." In addition, at col. 3 lines 56-60, Hummel reads in part:

The invention uses placeables to assist a translator by facilitating the automatic or semiautomatic replacement of placeables in the target language and making any necessary conversions according to the target locale, e.g., "German—Standard."

Thus, the Applicant submits that when the summary of the cited reference refers to the "context and environment of the placeable", the words "context and environment" are to be interpreted as specified above. In particular, "context and environment" does not

refer to the context of any particular word. Rather, it refers to the context of the entire document.

Moreover, "context and environment" information is not dynamically identified by examining tokens. This information is separate and apart from the text to be translated (i.e. it is not information gained from analysing tokens of the text). Rather, it is information that is known prior to analysing and translating the text.

The "context and environment" or the source and target language can affect how placeables are presented. For example, in continental European languages measurements are in given in metric units whereas in American English measurements are usually given in Imperial units. Similarly, dates are often formatted differently in English than in continental European languages. Similarly, although the Hummel reference does not go into detail on this point, whether the text is in the legal environment or some other environment may presumably affect how certain placeables are treated.

The Hummel reference gives the example of translating a sentence from English to German (e.g. col.8 lines 1-7). The fact that the text is to be translated from English to German is not something that is dynamically determined from analysing the text. Yet, according to the teachings of the cited reference, the fact that translation occurs from English to German affects how placeables are treated. For example, speeds are converted from mph to km/h. This is done not because of some dynamic determination made during an analysis of the text. Rather, this is done because the translation is done from English to German and because in the United States people customarily refer to speeds in mph while Germans uses km/h. Similarly dates might be adjusted from the American format to the European format. Again, this is not done because of some dynamic identification of context. Rather, it is done so that the placeable appears in a form that would make sense in that language in which it appears. Accordingly, if the translation occurs from English to German, then it will be known beforehand that units

will be converted from imperial to metric. Clearly, this is not the result of a dynamic determination of a contextual state.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Hummel does not teach dynamically identifying a contextual state.

B. Placeable identification and subsequent handling

The Examiner also cited col. 4, lines 23-26, and stated that it illustrated that the "placeable is identified in order to facilitate subsequent handling".

With respect, the Applicant submits that this is neither evidence that a determination of a contextual state is made nor that the determination is made dynamically. Specifically, as shown above, placeables are context free and therefore regardless of whether placeables are identified in order to facilitate subsequent handling, this does not indicate that a dynamic determination of context is made. Therefore, the cited portion of text does not teach a dynamic identification of a contextual state.

C. Dynamic identification of a contextual state

The Examiner also cited col. 7, lines 25-31, and 44-51, the determination of a date is determined using views of the entire token and "the identifying is dynamic where each placeable is identified and converted based on determiner placeable type." The Examiner also argued that Hummel teaches determining whether a word is associated with the expression utilizing the contextual state. In support of this argument, the Examiner cited col. 7, lines 44-51, as illustrating "state determined by looking at the entire token"

The Applicant respectfully submits that the determinations discussed in col. 7 are not in anyway equivalent to dynamically identifying a contextual state. The cited portion of the text refers to a "finite state process that examines each character of a token"; however, nowhere does the cited reference indicate that this is in anyway similar to a

determination of a contextual state or that a contextual state is used to determine if words are part of an expression.

Column 7 generally discusses how a placeable is identified and treated and as stated above, placeables are inherently context free. The Examiner's attention is drawn to col. 7 lines 54-55, which read: "One of the identifying features of a placeable is that its meaning is not likely to vary by context." Therefore, given that placeables are context free, identifying a placeable is not equivalent to identifying a contextual state. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Hummel does not teach dynamically identifying a contextual state.

D. Viewing the next token

The Examiner also stated "Further, in order to determine the type of conversion needed the next token is viewed, thus utilizing a context".

It is not clear, which portion of the text the Examiner is referring to here. The above-quoted sentence appears after the citation of col.7 lines 44-51. However, the applicant was unable to find any text in the cited reference that referred to examining the next token in order to determine what type of conversion is needed.

3. Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully submits that, from the above arguments, it is clear that the Hummel reference does not teach the identification of a contextual state. It is submitted that Hummel teaches the use of placeables that are context free elements to facilitate translation. The identification and handling of placeables are the focus of the teachings of Hummel. Therefore, Hummel is focused on the use of context free elements and does not teach how to identify a contextual state.

In addition, the Examiner has conceded that Alleva does not teach identifying a contextual state. Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that none of the cited

references, whether taken singly or in any combination, do not teach dynamically identifying a contextual state.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that claims 1 and 20 are both novel and not obvious in light of the cited documents. Similarly, it is respectfully submitted that each of the remaining claims, which depend directly from claim 1 and 20, are also novel and not obvious in view of the cited documents. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 is respectfully requested.

All of the Examiner's concerns have now been addressed. It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is requested. If the Examiner has any further concerns regarding the language of the claims or the applicability of the cited references, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Alexander Anishchenko, Reg. No. 63,827
Bereskin & Parr, Customer No. 001059
Tel: (416) 957-1679